

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-14 are pending.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-14¹ were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rysgaard et al. (EP 0966136, hereinafter Rysgaard).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Independent Claim 1 is directed to a language selecting method that includes steps of (1) transmitting, from the mobile station to the service providing apparatus, language select information for selecting a language in which information is to be received, when the mobile station starts communication, (2) receiving, at the service providing apparatus, the language select information supplied from the mobile station, and (3) transmitting from the service providing apparatus to the mobile station, information in the language corresponding to the language select information.

An advantage with this approach is that because the mobile station transmits language select information for selecting a language in which information is to be received, when the mobile station starts communication, there is no need for the user to call, or otherwise communicate with the service provider. Moreover, by transmitting the language select information when the mobile station starts communication, the user merely needs to select the language from a memory of the mobile station so that the language select information can be generated and transmitted to the service providing operation when the mobile station starts communication. No separate dedicated communication step is required.

In contrast to the invention defined by Claim 1, Rysgaard is directed to a system in which the user may “dial a telephone number of a service provider via the first keyboard 75” (column 5, lines 3-6) once the telephone call is received, the use of the mobile telephone 1 can tell the agent at the central station 50 which text data groups the user wants to have

¹ Incorrectly described as Claims 6-14 in paragraph 5 of the outstanding Office Action.

changed and/or which new language the user wants to have provided in the memory area 15 of the mobile phone 1 for the text data (column 5, lines 26-31).

Rysgaard does not disclose that the language select information is transmitted when the mobile station starts communication. Rather, paragraph [0018] describes that the user of a telephone must contact the service provider to have the service provider transmit a new text file containing new text data groups in different languages. Moreover, in Rysgaard, it is the user that makes the communication to request a change in text data groups transmitted to the service provider.

Comparing Claim 1 to Rysgaard, Claim 1 requires that the mobile station transmit language select information when the mobile station starts communication. In contrast, Rysgaard does not have the mobile station transmit language select information when the mobile station starts communication, but rather requires an operator-actuated process where the user dials an agent at the central station 50 and tells the agent which text data groups he wants to have changed and/or which new language the user wants to have downloaded to the memory area. Accordingly, Rysgaard does not describe transmitting from the mobile station language select information when the mobile station starts communication. A clear disadvantage is that the user must be involved in the system in Rysgaard to request a download of text data groups. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Rysgaard does not disclose at least the first transmitting step in Claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate Claim 1. Because Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Although Claim 6 is of a different statutory class it contains a feature where the mobile station includes a transmission unit for transmitting the language select information when starting communication. As discussed above with regard to Claim 1, Rysgaard does

not describe this feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 as well as Claims 7-10 which depend from Claim 6 patentably define over the asserted prior art.

For substantially the same reasons it is believed that Claims 11-12 also patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Claim 13 has been amended to clarify that the service providing apparatus receives the language select information from the mobile station when starting a communication session. Thus amended Claim 13 and Claim 14 which depends therefrom, are believed to patentably define over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-14, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
BDL:smi

I:\ATTY\BDL\219272US\219272US-AM.DOC